

Informal Communication – Not for entry – Interview agenda – 10/719,345 – 10191/3480

Agenda for Interview of 12/1/09

Attention Examiner Gary Mui (unit 2416)

Generally, Applicants seek to clarify the Office's interpretation of the present claims and subject matter to ideally ensure the next amendment is productive with respect to the current art, or at least a final form for Appeal. Applicants would appreciate any input from the Office with regard to allowable subject matter and/or productive amendments to clarify the novel features of the present claims.

Specifically, Applicants would like to discuss the following potential arguments in an effort to find a productive amendment that avoids a time-consuming appeal.

1. Applicants believe the combination of Weigl and Suzuki is not obvious. Weigl being generally directed to a system for facilitating a plurality of users on a shared bus, whereas Suzuki is directed to optimizing bandwidth in a DSL system. To a degree, Weigl seems incompatible with Suzuki, as the purpose of Suzuki appears to be to increase the amount of unique data per time period (i.e. transmission bandwidth), and transmitting an identical message multiple times (which Weigl is asserted for) is counter productive to the purpose of Suzuki.
2. Applicants believe "changing the transmission rate for a transmission time slot in order to repeatedly transmit a single message" (paraphrased) is a single feature for which no prior art exists. If the Office believes some consistent amendment exists that better presents this feature as a single feature or otherwise non-obvious feature with regard to Weigl/Suzuki, Applicants are open to such an amendment. One suggestion may include incorporating the fault tolerance aspect into the feature. Example: "changing the transmission rate for a transmission time slot in order to repeatedly transmit a single message multiple times; and comparing each transmission of the single message in order to determine a fault tolerant correct version" (paraphrased for general discussion, not formal claim amendment language).

Please advise if further information is required. Otherwise, Applicant's representative (John Gillick) looks forward to discussing this case with you Tuesday December 1, 2009 at 10am at 571-270-1420.

Regards,

John Gillick, 63,027